



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,732	09/12/2003	In Hee Han	9988.057.00-US	4914
30827	7590	08/08/2007	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP			GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL	
1900 K STREET, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			3749	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/08/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/660,732	HAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Stephen Gravini	3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u> </u>
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u> </u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u> </u>

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In this application, claim 9 recites a "motor shaft includes chamfers parallel to each other." That recitation is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Although figure 5 shows a section of a motor shaft from figure 3, there is no specification discussion such that it would be reasonable to convey the parallel feature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tremblay (US 2,547,238) in view of Cunha (US 5,664,936). The claims are reasonably and broadly construed, in light of the accompanying specification, to be disclosed by Tremblay, as comprising:

a motor bracket **50** fixed to a bottom of the dryer;

a motor **48** mounted on the motor bracket, the motor including a motor shaft extending therefrom. Tremblay discloses the claimed invention, except for the claimed

fan coupled with the motor shaft, wherein the motor shaft includes chamfers parallel to each other and configured for facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft.

Cunha, another home appliance fan coupled motor shaft, discloses the predictable feature of a fan coupled with the motor shaft, wherein the motor shaft includes chamfers parallel to each other and configured for facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft in figures 3 & 4 and column 2 lines 46-67, particularly figure 3 wherein the chamfer-like shaft portions are expressly shown to be parallel to each other. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Tremblay with the fan coupled with the motor shaft, wherein the motor shaft includes chamfers parallel to each other and configured for facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft, as disclosed in Cunha, for the predictable purposes of avoiding relative longitudinal movements between a central hub to a motor shaft assembly by the semi-circular shape of both the shaft end and tubular central hub the need for additional parts and a difficult slow mounting operation that will consequently increase the cost of the product, no requirement of additional parts, making the assembly fast and practical, without impairing the desired result of facilitating removal of the fan from the motor shaft, allowing automation of the mounting operation by mutually attaching said two pieces, thus reducing the costs of the product, and a fitting being obtained by the elastic deformation of part of the lateral wall of said central hub.

Double Patenting

Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,874,248 in

view of either Torborg, Reisch, and/or Cunha. Applicants' assignee earlier patent discloses the claimed invention, claiming each element, except for the claimed chamfer portion. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine chamfer portion, construed disclosed by Torborg, Reisch, and/or Cunha, for the purpose of facilitating insertion of a body into a shaft or for providing a complementary cross section fitting for such intended uses including claimed statements of tool cooperation or removal facilitation.

Response to Appeal Brief

It was suggested during an appeals conference with examiner's supervisor and an appeals conference specialist, that a more appropriate obviousness rejection should be made in light of new Office procedures guided by the KSR v. Teleflex US Supreme Court decision. Based on the suggestions of the conference, the anticipation rejection of claim 9 is withdrawn, but the new matter and double patenting rejections are maintained. Since claim 9 has been amended after an Office action on the merits, it is believed a final action is proper.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven B. McAllister can be reached on 571 272 6785. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SMG
August 6, 2007

STBm/Att
STEVE MCALLISTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Stephen Gravini